

CONCORDIA UNIVERSITY

Council of the Faculty of Arts and Science

Minutes of the meeting held on Friday, February 8, 1991

- Present: C.L. Bertrand; M. Yates; B. Harris; P. Albert; S. Ruby; F. Stevens; C. White; T. Swift; M. Szabo; J. Appleby; J. Gavin; P. Widden; Z. Hamlet; E. Preston; G. Kanaan; D. Shapiro; W. Knitter; H. McQueen; G. Auchinachie; C. Lévy; R. Kilgour; M. Barlow; G. Sassano; G. Decarie; M. Armstrong; H. Shulman; A. Galler; C. Davis; W. Byers; A. Teffeteller; R. Sharma; N. Segalowitz; M. Taylor; S. Hoecker-Drysdale; G. Newsham; J. Ryan; J. Snyder; G. Bastien; K. Clément; R. Gotlieb; G. Grougrou; J. Gruman; B. Leonhardt; J. Serruya; T. Taylor.
- Guests: P. de Vries; D. Howes.
- Regrets: M. Brian; B. Lewis; J. Locke; M. Poirier; M. Oppenheim; C. Potworowski; S. Lanthier-O'Connor.
- Absent: J. Lightstone; G. Fisher; R. Perigoe; C. Gray; E. Budik; L. Cohen; H. Danakas; J. Drolet; S. Farber; E. Kalantar; P. Richards.

Documents Distributed and Considered at this meeting:

- ASFC 91-2M-A Election/Ratification - Arts and Science Faculty Committees
- ASFC 91-2M-B M.A. in Social and Cultural Anthropology (Report 70G - 1992/93) - A New Graduate Program Proposal
- ASFC 91-1M-B Discussion of Graduate Review Document

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 2:06 p.m.

2. Approval of Agenda

Dean Bertrand requested that Council approve the Agenda with Items 3 and 4 in reverse order.

91-2-1 It was moved and seconded (Levy/Hamlet) that the Agenda be accepted as changed.

Carried.

3. Approval of Minutes of January 11, 1991

91-2-2 It was moved and seconded (Davis/Stevens) that the Minutes of the Arts and Science Faculty Council meeting of January 11, 1991, be accepted as circulated.

Dean Szabo asked if the hand-out of the transcript of "The Committee of the Whole" was a part of the official minutes.

Dean Bertrand responded that it was not part of the official minutes.

Carried.

4. Remarks from the Chair

Dr. Bertrand informed Council that the piano now in the Senate Chambers was the same as had been in the Dean's office for the past few months. It would remain in the Senate Chambers until laboratory space was ready - sometime in April 1991.

Dr. Bertrand announced that this year's Council meeting to approve the Graduation Lists for Spring 1991 Convocation would be held on May 21, 1991, at 9:30 a.m.

Dr. Bertrand said that members of Council might have read in the Thursday Report about possible moves or changes in space allocation within the university. Dr. Bertrand informed Council that the Vice Rector, Services, established a special committee in the Fall of 1990 to look at the overall space situation within the university and to prepare a report. That committee was now in the process of preparing its report. Dr. Bertrand said that he had been assured that if a report were issued, then the Associate Vice Rector, Services intended to initiate general consultation throughout the university on the contents of the report.

Dr. Bertrand announced that as a result of the Annual Giving Campaigns of 1988/89 and 1989/90 the Faculty had some \$20,000 of unrestricted funds available to it as well as approximately \$12,000 of restricted funds. He had recently released the restricted funds to Chairs, Directors and Principals with the caveat that the funds be used to enhance the academic life of the department and/or program. The Dean hoped that the money would be spent in such a way that it would encourage more donations in the Annual Giving Campaign of 1990/91.

The Faculty Committee on Development (Dr. John Drysdale, Sociology; Professor Mair Verthuy, Etudes françaises; Ms. Marie-France Sampson, Exercise Science; Ms. Carole Kleingrib, University Advancement; Mr. Donald Thomas, Canadian Pacific, Concordia alumnus; Dean, Faculty of Arts and Science) decided on the following distribution of the unrestricted funds:

- 1) \$14,000 for the base funding of an annual prize to be awarded to the winner of The David McKeen Essay Competition, in memory of David McKeen. David McKeen was a former member of the English Department who was a skilled writer and was very prominent in forwarding the importance of writing skills. The Committee felt that such a competition open to all undergraduate students in the Faculty of Arts and Science (on a topic to be decided by the committee in the fall) would help to emphasize the importance of writing skills in all courses in the faculty. The Committee also hoped that this would be a vehicle to convince faculty members of their responsibility to help students develop writing skills. The topics would be general enough so that students from any discipline could participate. The prize would be around \$1200.
- 2) \$2000 was to be given to the funding for the Irving Layton Award for Creative Writing, which also promoted writing skills. This amount should make the Irving Layton Award self-financing so that each year's interest would pay the award.
- 3) \$3541 would be given to the Documentation Centre for Women's Studies located in the Simone de Beauvoir Institute.
- 4) \$1000 was to allocated to the Mair Verthuy Scholarship in Women's Studies. This would solidify the base funding so that the interest would pay for the scholarship each year.
- 5) \$3365 was to be given to the Diploma Program in Ecotoxicology.

Dr. Bertrand reminded Council that the next campaign would begin in April and any ideas from members of Council for priorities in Arts and Science should be sent to the Dean before March 4th when the Committee would be meeting to discuss priority items for the next campaign. Prospective donors could then be informed that the Faculty of Arts and Science would like funds for specific items.

Dr. Bertrand mentioned that work had begun on the next Capital Campaign. He had already asked Chairs for priorities for the Faculty. If Council members had ideas for this campaign the Dean would be pleased to receive them.

Dr. Bertrand said that he was pleased to announce that he had received authorization to convert two limited term appointments, one in Women's Studies and one joint appointment in Women's Studies and Etudes françaises into Tenure Track positions. The programme in Women's Studies would have 2 1/2 full-time faculty members by June 1, 1991.

There were also 4 tenure track appointment offers made from the Faculty in the last week and all 4 happened to have been offered to women. The Faculty was doing something positive about the employment equity situation.

The Dean gave Council members an update on the gender questions for the course evaluation questionnaires. To date 18 departments had responded: 7 had agreed to use the two questions as submitted; 3 had agreed to use question 1; 4 had agreed to formulate their own questions and had set up committees to do so; and 4 voted no to both questions.

5. Questions and Announcements

Dr. Decarie asked if there were guidelines published for the use of data from the course evaluations because he was disturbed to read a letter in the Thursday Report from the Director of Women's Studies suggesting that this data would be used not only in a highly scientific way but also in a way that was never intended when the course evaluations were designed. He noted that at present, his understanding was that comments were to be available only to the instructor involved but he was afraid that we seemed to be moving toward a situation where some people felt that course evaluations could be used for a very wide range of purposes. He felt that some of these might give rise to threats to academic freedom. He suggested that in order to avoid a lot of divisiveness quick action was necessary to define the appropriate uses (and the appropriate people to make those uses information) of the course

evaluation data.

Dean Bertrand responded that he would speak to Dr. Ron Smith from the Learning Development Office to see if he had started to work on guidelines as soon as possible.

Professor Shulman asked how the members of the committee to deal with the question of space had been chosen and who had chosen them.

Dr. Bertrand said that he believed that faculty members were chosen by the Vice-Rector, Services. He also believed that the Vice Rector wished to have faculty members who were not identified closely with space or who had not worked on space committees before so that they would have relatively open minds. Dr. Bertrand believed that there were two faculty members from Arts and Science and one faculty member from each of the other three faculties.

6. Election/Ratification - Arts and Science Faculty Committees

Arts and Science Faculty Steering Committee

Mr. Jose Serruya (MATH)

Acclaimed

Arts and Science Faculty Appeal Committee

Dr. Claude Levy (FRAN)

Acclaimed

NOTICE OF ELECTION

One (1) full-time faculty member to serve on the following Advisory Search Committees:

Advisory Search Committees for the Appointment of Chairperson:

Department

Applied Social Science
Biology
Chemistry and Biochemistry
Etudes Françaises

Current Chair/Director
Term ending May 31, 1991

Dr. R. Cawley
Dr. P. Widden
Dr. P. Bird
Prof. M. Catry-Verron

Geography
 Mathematics and Statistics
 Religion
 TESL

Dr. M. Barlow
 Dr. W. Byers
 Dr. M. Oppenheim
 Dr. B. Barkman

Advisory Search Committees for the Appointment of Principal/Director:

<u>College/Programme</u>	<u>Current Principal/Director</u> <u>Term Ending May 31, 1991</u>
Leisure Studies	Dr. R. Swedburg
Liberal Arts College	Prof. Harvey Shulman
Science College	Prof. G. Szamosi
School for Community and Public Affairs	Dr. D. Shapiro
Simone de Beauvoir Institute	Prof. A. Hamalian

Nominations should be forwarded to Dr. Bertrand's office (AD-324) by March 4, 1991.

7. New Graduate Program Proposal - M.A. in Social and Cultural Anthropology

Dr. Bertrand asked Dr. Stevens to introduce the document.

Dr. Stevens stated that it was her pleasure to present to Council the new graduate program proposal from the Department of Sociology and Anthropology for an M.A. in Social and Cultural Anthropology. The Faculty Curriculum Committee had thoroughly reviewed this proposal and considered it to be sound academically, innovative in its field and attractive to students. Dr. Stevens expressed her thanks to the Faculty Curriculum Committee for the hard work that was put into shaping the proposal into a finished document.

Dr. Stevens asked Council for speaking privileges for Dr. Pieter de Vries, Chair of Sociology and Anthropology and Professor David Howes so that they might answer questions raised by members of Council. Speaking privileges were granted to both Dr. de Vries and Professor Howes.

90-2-3

It was moved and seconded (Stevens/Hoecker-Drysdale) that Arts and Science Faculty Council accept the Graduate Program Proposal for an M.A.

in Social and Cultural Anthropology from the Department of Sociology and Anthropology.

Dr. de Vries said that as the first Anthropologist to be Chair of the Department of Sociology and Anthropology it gave him great pleasure and pride to see this proposal come to Council. He wished to paraphrase their "clan mother" Margaret Mead in saying that this proposal represented a coming of age of Anthropology at Concordia. Unlike many other universities in North America this coming of age of Anthropology at Concordia had not involved the separation of Anthropology from Sociology. That was a rather interesting commentary and development. Initially out of necessity, but increasingly out of conviction, his department saw the development of Anthropology in relation to Sociology. The development of this proposal involved participation by both Anthropologists and Sociologists alike. It also represented a departmental consensus about the direction of this development. While the development of the proposal was a team effort, one person in particular acted both as Editor and Point Person, that person was Professor David Howes. Dr. de Vries asked Professor Howes to comment on the substance of the proposal.

Professor David Howes said that developing a graduate program in Anthropology at this particular time provided a unique opportunity to correct the mistakes of the past and incorporate recent theoretical advances. One of the advances reflected in the document was that instead of simply extending the concepts and methods of western social science and western human sciences to other societies - what was attempted was to recognize the contributions of those other societies to understanding those concepts and methods. What was being attempted now was to elaborate methods through the course in field work methods which would get around the univocal kind of understanding of a culture and begin to allow some of the other voices to speak, to allow some of the subordinate groups within a society - most notably women - to gain a voice. He stressed that those two emphases (intercultural theory and recognizing the plurality of a culture under study) were two of the many factors which distinguished this program from those which were offered at other universities.

Another emphasis of the proposal was the emphasis on the ethical and political dimensions of the field work encounter. Instead of being a scientific or intellectual exercise what was being brought out was how ethnographers had an obligation to their hosts which must be requited in some way. The role of the cultural mediator was not simply an academic one or an applied one, but both. It was the kind of graduate that they hoped to produce which made the proposal so significant.

The third feature of the proposal was the emphasis on ethnography. By introducing students to the ethnographic experience through doing field work at the master's level, they hoped to facilitate that experience at a much earlier point. The emphasis on ethnography involved the study of writing methods, which was being dealt with in the course on Writing Culture. The idea was that Anthropologists must come to experiment both with different media and with different styles for the presentation of ethnographic findings in order to communicate most effectively. A strong emphasis was placed on interdisciplinary research. There were four Anthropologists involved at this point as well as three Sociologists and one representative from Communication Studies, all of whom would be directly involved in the running of this program. The interdisciplinary focus would be another distinguishing feature of this program.

Dr. Bertrand thanked Dr. de Vries and Professor Howes for their remarks and asked if there was any discussion of the proposal.

Dean Szabo asked what the expected audience would be for the program.

Professor Howes reported that they had surveyed students who have graduated and who were registered in the department at present and the response was favourable. The department expected an enrolment of 10 or 12 students per year.

Professor Armstrong asked what would be the resource implications for the department. She also asked if the department felt that library holdings were adequate to support this additional program.

Professor Howes responded that the library report was not yet completed. The department felt that with the library resources available at McGill and the University of Montreal, library facilities would be sufficient. In terms of numbers, the department felt they would be able to cope with 10 to 12 students in the program.

Dr. Sassano asked for an explanation of the division of the credits between the two years. From his reading of the document, there were 15 credits of courses in the first year but in the second year there were 27 credits to be completed. What was the rationale for having so few credits of course work and so many credits to be completed in the second year as compared to the first.

Professor Howes responded that there was an emphasis on the thesis, which also included emphasis on field work, in that there were a certain number of

credits for the report based on the field work. What was being tried was the extraction of core courses to be augmented with a personal and intense involvement between staff and students in a field work experience. This had been designed for both full-time and part-time students.

Ms. Taylor wanted to know how this program would affect undergraduate students. She asked if the shift in the department was going to change from an undergraduate to a graduate focus and wondered whether undergraduate students were going to be neglected.

Professor Howes responded that the department had a very strong commitment to their undergraduate students. The various research interests of faculty members would be advanced by having a pool of graduate students to work with; teaching assistantships would be available and all of this would significantly enrich the undergraduate experience of students in the department. The department did not perceive that this would detract from the undergraduate experience. The honours undergraduate program, for instance, continued to grow and the department expected that trend to continue.

Dr. de Vries added that the department had reached a stage in the development of Anthropology where undergraduates had begun to feel the negative effects of the absence of a graduate program. The department received many requests from undergraduate students for further research and to have graduate level research ongoing within the department could only help the undergraduate students.

Ms. Taylor asked if the major and minor programs would be affected.

Dr. de Vries responded that the majors specialization, and honours programs would continue to be the main focus of the department as far as Anthropology was concerned.

Dr. Ryan asked if copyright restrictions would affect the proposed program. In regard to the difficulties with serial holdings and the cooperation of libraries he wondered what strategies the department would devise to overcome those difficulties.

Professor Howes responded that he was not fully abreast of the copyright legislation but that one of the emphases of the proposal was the generation of material and that most of the background material would be from Archival sources which would probably not be affected in quite the same way as other

materials.

Dr. Newsham asked how four members of the department would be able to teach the additional 18 credits.

Dr. de Vries responded that the department was hoping to hire another Anthropologist. There were also Sociology professors involved who would teach some of the credits.

Dr. Bertrand responded to Professor Armstrong and Dr. Newsham that the faculty was in the process of hiring another Anthropologist. He would also make a request to the Vice-Rector Institutional Relations and Finance that another position be authorized. He believed that this proposal would benefit undergraduate as well as graduate students. The situation in Quebec City these days seemed to be that if a university could demonstrate that it was already committed to providing the staff and resources for a new program, the better the chance of having that program approved at the level of the Minister of Education. Library holdings never seemed to be fully adequate, even at Harvard University's great library, there were always gaps. Depending on what the library report said, it might be possible to submit a request for funds to improve the library collection (which again would benefit undergraduate students). Dr. Bertrand felt confident that resources could be found within the current structure to provide one additional faculty member. Usually a proposal would not get to Council unless the Dean and the Chair of the Department were satisfied that resources were adequate.

Dean Szabo asked what other interdepartmental cooperation would be available.

Professor Howes responded that connections with History, Communication Studies and possible connections with Education would be attempted. These would be done by personal contact and through courses in these departments that could be cross-listed.

Dean Szabo asked if that was documented in the proposal.

Professor Howes referred him to Section 3.5

Dr. de Vries emphasized that the department was already a joint department housing two separate disciplines in one department.

Dr. Bertrand asked if there were further questions. There being none, a vote was taken on **Motion 91-2-3**.

Carried.

8. Follow-up Discussion of Graduate Review Document

Dr. Bertrand said that Council would continue the discussion on the Graduate Review Document that was started at the January meeting.

Dr. Bertrand welcomed Dean Szabo, Dean of the Division of Graduate Studies to this meeting. Dean Szabo was unable to attend the January meeting of Council.

91-2-4

It was moved and seconded (Byers/Leonhardt) that Arts and Science Faculty Council endorse Recommendations 1, 2, 3, 4 and 11 of the Report of the Review of the Division of Graduate Studies.

Dr. Knitter was still left with a question as to what besides the name was being changed as merely changing from the Division of Graduate Studies to the School of Graduate Studies would not change the workings of graduate studies at Concordia.

Dean Szabo said that it was the beginning of a process to integrate various aspects and responsibilities of graduate studies into a system where there would be a proper balance between responsibility and accountability. The intent was to set up a number of Task Forces to systematically explore the proper management of those components within the university in order to ensure that the University could take maximum advantage of its opportunities. It would take Graduate Studies out of an Ad-hoc environment and place it in an environment that could be monitored, at the same time giving it the appropriate structure to the benefit everyone.

Dr. McQueen said that his department was opposed to most of the recommendations in the report. They were not concerned with whether Graduate Studies was called a School or Division. They felt that building up a new faculty would result in the other faculties losing resources and facilities. Engineering had a strong graduate school. They felt that they were getting satisfactory services from the Division of Graduate Studies and did not want to see it tremendously enlarged. In addition, there was the question of who would belong to the Council of Graduate Studies and whether this would drain away human resources from the faculty. It seemed to Engineering that faculty who now formed the Board of Graduate Studies should be the ones

involved in the Council of the School of Graduate Studies. In Engineering all departments had a graduate program and almost all faculty were involved with research. They found the proposed structure to be somewhat artificial.

Ms. Taylor said that the undergraduate focus must be kept in mind at this university and informed Council that undergraduate students did not wish to be treated as "cash cows".

Dean Szabo stated that the Board of Graduate Studies would become the Council of the School of Graduate Studies. He assumed that the same members would serve on the new body. The notion of a terminal undergraduate university, that being a university without graduate programs would not be acceptable in the North American context. Graduate studies bring in tremendous resources and the presence of graduate studies at a university was often responsible for attracting top names to the professorate. An essential element in a university was the presence of graduate studies and research to keep professors up-to-date and excited about what they do. The Faculty of Arts and Science had a Science College which attracted some of the finest students in the province. The Science College had a recruitment problem in the past and decided to advertise the success rate of their graduates in graduate school last year. The number of applications this year was such that they had to turn away highly qualified students. Good students look for a university where they would have opportunities at all levels. Financially, it was more difficult for students to change universities to do a further degree because of the way funding was arranged; it was important, therefore, to have both levels of study at Concordia.

Dr. Levy asked if Dr. Decarie's letter concerning the rewording of Recommendation 5, which was circulated to Council members would be considered.

Dr. Bertrand responded that Dr. Decarie's letter referred to Recommendations 5 and 16 which would be considered after the discussion on Recommendations 1, 2, 3, 4 and 11.

Dr. Byers reminded Council that these recommendations were the result of the success of the development of graduate studies at Concordia and not its failure. It seemed appropriate to the Review Committee that the university should look again at the organization of graduate studies and consider whether or not it should be changed in certain ways as the way it was organized at Concordia was substantially different from that of other Canadian universities. He thought that these reforms, far from being

threatening to Arts and Science, would prove to be beneficial to the development of graduate programs within this Faculty. He pointed out that having graduate programs did not mean that there was less energy for undergraduate programs. There was no question that Concordia would abandon its traditional role with respect to undergraduate education in attempting to build strong graduate programs. These two issues were compatible and there was no choice but to move in this direction.

Ms. Taylor pointed out that good teachers attracted good students. She wished to see as much emphasis on new ground-breaking undergraduate programs. She wanted equal weight given to both undergraduate and graduate programs. As far as she was concerned, research and development went hand in hand with graduate studies and led to large classes and inaccessible professors. Small classes was one of the strengths of Concordia University. She felt that the money for new graduate programs had to come from undergraduate budgets.

Dr. Decarie supported the proposal but wished to know if the School would have any power. If it had no power he wondered why it was being created. If it had power, then of course that power must come from somewhere else. He acknowledged that this was going to cause a certain amount of strain for the undergraduate programs. It was going to attract resources and faculty time mainly because faculty members were attracted by the prestige of graduate students. The suggestion that having researchers here would attract students at the undergraduate level was surely untrue. There cannot be ten students in this whole university who came here because of any particular professor's research. He noted that there were very solid political reasons why this proposal must go ahead.

Dr. Segalowitz said that the experience in the Psychology Department was that graduate studies was a great help and enriched the undergraduate program immensely. They had one of the largest graduate programs in Québec and Canada and undergraduate numbers continued to grow. Students seemed to be attracted to the program because of the quality of the department and because of the international reputation of the faculty. It could not be argued that the undergraduate program in Psychology had suffered because of the graduate program. There were growing pains and resource strains but everyone benefitted. What was needed in this university was some mechanism or structure for disseminating and consolidating the good things that happen. For example if Engineering had a great deal of positive experiences in running their graduate programs then Arts and Science, or Fine Arts and Commerce and Administration should hear about that so that the good things that happen become enacted for the whole

university.

Dr. Bertrand noted that the student population was 21,000 undergraduates and 3500 graduates. This university was committed to maintaining smaller classes and if someone saw that slipping away this Council was one forum where that concern should be raised and discussed. Similarly, if students began to see that they were only being taught by teaching assistants then they should air this concern at Faculty Council. If students saw that undergraduate advising was being done not by faculty but by graduate assistants then that too should be brought to this forum. There was still a great deal of awareness of the importance of undergraduate studies. At the same time there has been a development of graduate studies in this university over the past 15 years. The review document did not reflect a new push for graduate studies. It was an acknowledgement that graduate programs had developed so successfully that the structure in place was now outdated and needed to be replaced to make certain that the responsibility and accountability of graduate programs rested where it should. It did not mean that this Council would lose any power over the establishment and change of programs in the Faculty of Arts and Science. Faculty Council would retain its full powers. Students would always have a say in the development of undergraduate and graduate programs.

Dr. Knitter said that while he felt that the development of graduate studies was desirable he disagreed that diligent vigilance alone would work. There were two zero-sum games and on the whole he felt the undergraduates would be the ones to lose. One was zero-sum energy and the other was zero-sum money. At the moment the number of courses taught by part-time faculty at the undergraduate level was about 50% and much, much less at the graduate level. As graduate programs expanded there would be an even higher number of courses taught by part-timers at the undergraduate level. Part-timers did a terrific job in the department of Education which couldn't operate without them. On the other hand, full-timers were there to review programs and give them care and the more the full-timers depart from the undergraduate side of education the less care would be given. He did not see the commitment from the Administration that should be there for the undergraduate level and unless that changed undergraduate education would lose.

Dr. Auchinachie remarked that the new Collective Agreement allowed incoming professors to teach 12 credits where they used to come in and teach 18 credits. Productive young scholars would likely therefore have less of an involvement at the undergraduate level perhaps teaching 6 credits or at most 9 credits and half of their load would be at the graduate. It still meant that part-timers would have to be used. To rephrase what Dean Szabo said,

though more crassly, there was a resource implication because the university was paid more per head for graduate student and therefore we had to expand graduate studies because that was where the money was. High profile professors could change the university but it might be that these persons could conceivably never teach an undergraduate course.

Professor Shulman reminded Council that moving forward with graduate programs would obviously have resource implications. The document suggested course remissions for professors involved in research and thesis supervision. His own feeling was that part-time budgets would be cut and there was no question that eventually a situation would emerge where there would have to be significant cuts in undergraduate enrolment perhaps by as much as 25% to 30%. He pointed out that small classes at Concordia were not part of a great master plan - it was simply a question of not having large classrooms available.

Dr. Ryan saw two separate issues - one being the fear that because graduate studies were successful they would gobble up the university resources; the other being do we want to artificially stymie what was a growing graduate presence at the university. He acknowledged that administrative and jurisdiction problems existed in the running of graduate programs and these must be cleared up so that the School of Graduate Studies must have clarification as to its responsibilities.

Dr. Widden was distressed to hear a discussion on the merits of graduate versus undergraduate education. The university was a place where knowledge was pursued at both the undergraduate and the graduate level. He felt the discussion should be about how to make our graduate studies better and more successful. In the Biology Department research activity was somewhere in the middle. Over 1 million dollars came into the department as a result of research activity with about 10% being non-salary budget. It supported undergraduate students every year with jobs, these jobs involved them in research and laboratory work. That would not happen without a graduate program. He questioned why there was argument about the merits of undergraduate versus graduate education. He felt the discussion should be about university education - graduate and undergraduate. Undergraduate and graduate education should not be in competition with each other.

Dr. Sharma argued they were in competition right now. When he started many years ago there were no graduate programs and teaching was important and research secondary. Graduate studies came into being and expanded at a very fast rate and now research was most important. He noted that teaching has suffered as a result, especially at the first-year undergraduate

level where most courses were taught by part-time teachers or graduate students. He warned that unless there was a large injection of funds, a new structure for Graduate Studies was bound to affect the quality of undergraduate programs.

Dr. Newsham remarked that if the amount of money remained steady but commitments kept on growing then something had to give. She wanted to know if new funding would be available.

Dr. Bertrand responded that the problem with that question was that it did not relate to what was being discussed which was the restructuring of an already existing Division of Graduate Studies, in ways that the Review Committee presumably thought would make it function better, more effectively, more accountably and more responsibly. The resource issues raised were issues that might come up. They did come up in the discussion previous to this with respect to the new M.A. proposal from the Department of Sociology and Anthropology. The issue under debate did not have resource implications in and of itself. Down the line there would be resource implications. The issue before Council was does the Arts and Science Faculty Council approve of the idea of strengthening the Division of Graduate Studies by making it more effective, more responsible and more accountable by giving it a new name and allowing Senate to set up Task Forces to look into graduate studies. Presumably there would be other opportunities to debate the results of the Task Forces on the administrative and functional interaction and the role, mandate and composition of the new Council of Graduate Studies.

Mr. Leonhardt said that it was not a resource question but an organizational problem.

There being no further discussion Dr. Bertrand called for a vote on the motion 91-2-4:

Carried.

Dean Bertrand asked whether there were other comments or motions to be made on the Graduate Studies Review Document.

Dr. White suggested that the word "effect" in Recommendation 12 should in fact be "affect" and asked that it be so changed.

Dean Szabo took note of Dr. White's suggestion regarding Recommendation 12.

Dr. Decarie suggested that Recommendation 5 be reworded. He understood the Committee's wish to draw certain priorities to the attention of those who would draft a mission statement but thought it unwise to dictate what the statement should say. Certain concerns could be brought to that Committee's attention without instructing them what they must say.

Dean Szabo said that he would take Dr. Decarie's statement as a comment about Recommendation 5. He felt that it should be sent to the attention of the Vice Rector rather than be raised as a change to the document.

Dr. Decarie asked whether Council had the power to change the wording of the report.

Dean Szabo responded that the Report had come from the Vice Rector's office and it could only be commented on by Council.

Dr. Byers pointed out that Recommendations in the Report were not all directed to the same people. Recommendation 5 was directed to the Dean of Graduate Studies who was being asked to draft a Mission Statement. Therefore any comments on that recommendation should be addressed to the Dean of Graduate Studies.

Dean Szabo pointed out that a Mission Statement had been produced and sent to the Committee but that did not preclude the drafting of another.

Dean Bertrand said that he felt that Council could make comments on what it considered to be an inappropriate inclusion in a recommendation and could suggest how the recommendation might be reworded.

91-2-5

It was moved and seconded (Decarie/Levy) that Arts and Science Faculty Council recommend that sentences 2 and 3 of Recommendation 5 in the Report of the Review of the Division of Graduate Studies be understood to mean "the Committee should pay close attention to the development of interdisciplinary, inter-faculty, interuniversity, and international graduate programmes as well as

programmes in women's studies, environmental studies and urban studies".

Dr. Knitter said that in one sense the recommendation did not go far enough. Dr. Knitter would like to see no priorities listed in the recommendation. It was odd in terms of where ideas come from to suggest that a committee of a few people should advance ideas for development of other fields. It was very

difficult to develop interdisciplinary fields simply by committees calling for their development. It was inappropriate to set priorities in this way.

Dr. Byers responded that this should be seen as reflecting the presentations that were made to the Review Committee and concerns that were raised. The picture that the committee reviewing Graduate Studies came up with was formulated from input from various parts of the university and these priorities were developed into recommendations. He felt that he could support Dr. Decarie's motion as it would give the Dean and Division of Graduate Studies some feedback and additional information from this Council.

Dr. Ryan agreed with Dr. Knitter that there was some confusion of idiom here. He remarked that a document such as this should address formal and structural considerations not ones that dealt with content - these were out of place in this type of statement. His inclination would be to remove these from the document.

Dr. White mentioned that he had brought up this concern at the January meeting. The Vice Rector's response to his question was that these were issues that had been on the table for a long time and were not meant to exclude the development of other programs. He believed that the Vice Rector made it clear that these were just issues that had been raised and that other areas could be developed as priority areas at the same time.

Dr. McQueen said that Recommendation 5 had confused the Faculty of Engineering and Computer Science. Each discipline must decide when to develop a graduate program. There should be an appraisal process with an external consultant but it was their feeling that it was individual disciplines that had the competence to develop a graduate program. They could not have a body between the Engineering Faculty and Senate which could run the Engineering graduate departments. They felt that if the Engineering Faculty was able to run its undergraduate disciplines it should also be competent to run its graduate disciplines. It seemed from the Graduate Review Document that the Faculty of Graduate Studies should tell the Faculty of Arts and Science to develop the programs mentioned. They could not see the Faculty or School of Graduate Studies coming to them and saying that they had to develop a graduate program in Chemical Engineering just because someone on the Graduate Studies Council felt this would be a great thing to do regardless of whether there was anyone in Engineering who could run a program in Chemical Engineering. They thought the development of programs should flow upwards from the department or Faculty and that the role of Graduate Studies should be to judge whether the level of competence had been reached.

Dean Szabo noted that he received requests to develop new programs from faculty and students interested in such programs. What Dr. Byers had said echoed Dean Szabo's experience - there were certain areas where interest was focused for graduate program development. It was probably inappropriate for these areas to be listed in Recommendation 5 as it implied that these were the only areas of priority. His understanding from the discussion here at Council was that members recognized that there may well be a need for development in these three areas but that Recommendation 5 should not spell these out to the exclusion of other areas of interest. Faculty Council could of course pass a separate recommendation which recognized the need to develop graduate studies in these three areas.

Dr. Bertrand informed Dr. McQueen that not all three areas were specific to Arts and Science. He had already met with Dean Swamy to start discussions on the development of a graduate program in environmental studies.

Dr. Segalowitz understood Recommendation 5 to mean that a structure should be put in place to aid in the development of graduate programs.

Professor Shulman asked whether Dr. Decarie would agree to incorporate Dr. Knitter's concerns into this motion.

Dr. Bertrand said that he understood Dr. Knitter to want all specific references to the programs to be developed to be removed from the sentences concerned.

Dr. Knitter said that was so.

Dr. Decarie wanted his motion to stand as it was.

Carried.

91-2-6

It was moved and seconded (Byers/Ryan) that Arts and Science Faculty Council recommends that Recommendation 15 of the Report of the Review of Graduate Studies be amended to add the following sentence "It is essential for the School of Graduate Studies to develop the technical expertise to assist departments in the preparation and presentation of new program proposals so as to ensure that they conform to government requirements."

Dr. Byers explained that this was a problem that was identified by Graduate

Studies in the past and certainly there was a need for it. It was an expertise that was developed in practically every other Quebec university and it was a serious problem for Concordia University.

Dr. Ryan agreed that such expertise was needed at Concordia.

Carried.

91-2-7

It was moved and seconded (Decarie/Sharma) that Arts and Science Faculty Council inform Senate that Recommendation 16 of the Report of the Review of Graduate Studies is not endorsed by this Council.

mean that a Dr. Decarie was very concerned that this recommendation would suffer a redistribution of authority. *would be imposed on faculty* Whereas departments now decided who taught what, this recommendation would undermine that power. He was also concerned that this kind of committee or structure was dangerous. He recognized what the issue was trying to deal with and the Committee expected that such a definition would be an extremely limited one but he did not have faith that people in this university put in this position would use common sense in defining qualification. *mean that faculty would*

Dean Szabo responded that this was an important and difficult issue which Council could discuss at a later date but on occasion. However, in the past there have been occasions where conflicts arose between students and the supervisors with serious possible consequences for students. Departments have stepped in to solve some of the problems but in these cases the rights of the student were not formally recognized or acknowledged. There were many problems of this kind. This recommendation tried to deal with this issue, not to establish second-class professors. The issue was sufficiently important to warrant further discussion by this Council.

Professor Preston noted that the word in Recommendation 16 was NOT teach but supervise. The Committee felt that the concern with supervision should be addressed as well as the problem of continuity for the student's sake.

Dr. Ryan said that the problem seemed to be with the word "qualifications" - perhaps another word should be used.

Dr. Decarie pointed out that he did not have any quarrel with the intent of the Committee but that this recommendation did not solve the problem and could create severe problems and seemed dangerous.

Dr. Byers said that this was a problem. It seemed to him that the Graduate School should initiate discussion on this issue and that Graduate Studies should ask Councils for input and then after discussion it should be brought to Senate.

Defeated.

Dr. Widden said there was a recommendation that the S.I.P. program no longer be used as it had been in the past - i.e. by departments without a Ph.D. program.

Dr. Bertrand responded that it was not in this document but at the last meeting of the Board of Graduate Studies a motion was passed, effective June 1, 1990, that S.I.P. programs will no be available to normal disciplinary programs. The S.I.P. would be restricted to students enrolled in interdisciplinary, multi-disciplinary or cross-disciplinary studies.

Dr. Widden asked if Council could debate this issue because it would mean serious repercussions for Biology.

Dr. Bertrand said that Dr. Widden was free at any time to bring Biology's concerns to Steering Committee to be considered for discussion.

Dr. White asked how many people would constitute the advisory board referred to in Recommendations 8 and 9.

Dean Szabo responded that there were 50 to 60 graduate program directors in the university.

91-2-8

It was moved and seconded (White/Segalowitz) that Arts and Science Faculty Council recommends that the Assembly of Graduate Program Directors referred to in Recommendation 8 of the Report of the Review of Graduate Studies be limited to 1 program director from each department.

Carried.

Dr. Levy asked whether Recommendations 17 and 18 were to be discussed.

Dr. Bertrand said that any recommendation could be looked at by Council. However, when the Steering Committee looked at the list of

recommendations it was quite apparent the first 5 already voted on by Council would have to be approved at the level of Senate and at least one by the Board of Governors.

Dr. Levy asked whether the fact that Council did not discuss a particular recommendation, would mean support for the recommendation.

Dr. Bertrand said that it did not necessarily mean approval or disapproval but that Council had no comment to make on them.

Dean Szabo pointed out that this report was essentially directed to the Dean of Graduate Studies for response. It was the Dean's responsibility to respond on all of these points. Many of these had already been acted upon. Whatever was said at Council would be noted by him and taken into account when he drafted his response.

Dr. White said that Recommendation 9 had a long preamble which mentioned many different responsibilities involved in graduate education, some of which could impact on workload assignments. He found it surprising that the different responsibilities in the recommendation were limited to "all facets". The recommendation introduced other tasks that were not discussed in the preamble. He was interested to hear from the Committee something of what would be involved in "all facets" of graduate education and how it might apply to workload.

Dr. Byers responded that the Review Committee felt that there was a workload problem and one that had not been looked at in a very systematic way in the university. All that was being required by Recommendation 9 was that this question of involvement in graduate supervision and how it factored into workload, be examined. The Committee recommended that this be looked at and university-wide criteria developed.

Dr. Bertrand said that there were still some issues left that Council might wish to discuss and the document would be discussed one more time at the March meeting of Council.

9. Other Business

No other business was raised.

10. Date and Time of Next Meeting

The next meeting will be held Friday, March 15, 1991, at 2:00 p.m. in DL-200.

11. Adjournment

91-2-9 It was moved and seconded (Barlow/White) that the meeting be adjourned at 4:19 p.m.